DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 267 SO 022 665

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake; And Others
TITLE Enemy Images among University Students in Four Countries: A Cross-National Exploration Using an Associative Technique. Peace Education Miniprints No. 20.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE Sep 91
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Association Measures; Attitude Measures; College Students; Comparative Education; *Cross Cultural Studies; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *International Education; Peace; Psychological Studies; Social Bias; Social Science Research; *Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Denmark; *Enemies; Finland; *Peace Education; Sweden; USSR

ABSTRACT

Since "enemy imgaes" are important ingredients in preparedness for war, they merit study by researchers interested in peace education and in the psychology of peace and war. This study postulates that images of enemy groups, whether they be foreign countries or various subgroups within one's own country, are an important psychological construct to the willingness of persons to support the use of military force or warfare. The study examines the phenomenon of enemy images among university students in four countries--Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and the USSR. The study employed the use of an associative technique in which students were given a verbal stimulus (such as "The United States" or "The Soviet Union) and asked to write all the the words that occurred to them during a two minute period. Seven stimuli were used: the future, avoiding war, enemies of our country, peace, the United States, the Soviet Union, and human rights. The study was conducted during 1988 and 1989. Results included the finding that the attitudes of the university students from the four countries cannot be said to be greatly characterized by negative and stereotyped images of foreign countries or other foreign groups as enemies, or by militaristic attitudes in general. A 32-item list of references is included. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ENEMY IMAGES AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN FOUR COUNTRIES

A cross-national exploration using an associative technique

Åke Bjerstedt
University of Lund, Sweden

Jørgen Pauli Jensen
The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies
Copenhagen, Denmark

Søren Keldorff
University of Aalborg, Denmark

Olga Melnikova and *Yuri Shirkov*
Moscow University, USSR

Riitta Wahlström
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Since enemy images are important ingredients in preparedness for war, it would seem to be a valid task for psychological and educational peace research to study the phenomenon of enemy images in order to gain a better understanding of their frequency and their characteristics in various groups and under various conditions. This paper presents a simple associative technique that may be used in such studies and some findings from a cross-national pilot study of university students from four countries: Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the USSR.

Background

Images of enemy groups (countries, peoples, ethnic groups, minorities) are obviously important psychological ingredients in preparedness for war. If you feel that your country, for example, is threatened by another country, and if you feel that this enemy country is characterized by a series of extremely negative qualities, you will be more ready to use violent means against this country, more ready to go to war against it. It seems that expressions of enemy images are quite common, particularly among representatives of the military establishment in various countries. Such representatives tend to point to explicit or potential enemies and to use these threat images as arguments for increasing military forces. Propaganda is frequently used to strengthen, or even create, enemy images.

It is also often believed that enemy images are a more or less universal phenomenon, i.e. that we tend to look upon certain other countries as potential enemies that we have to defend ourselves against using military means. Psychologists tend to emphasize that enemy images may fulfil at least three functions: (a) they create a strong feeling of in-group identity ("we" against "the other"); (b) they permit us to act with aggression against "the other", when this other is defined as sufficiently "inhuman", "evil" and threatening to our values or interests; (c) they supply us with scapegoats onto which we can project various problems that bother us. In addition, psychologists have been interested in the external conditions for bringing about enemy images, for example, the socialization processes in the home and the school and the persuasive communication via mass media.

But how common are enemy images related to foreign countries among people in general? To what extent do they differ between countries and different subgroups within countries? Since enemy images are important in warfare, it would seem to be a valid task for psychological and educational peace research to study the phenomenon of enemy images in order to gain a better understanding of their frequency and their characteristics in various groups and under various conditions. Such an understanding is a necessary, although not sufficient, prerequisite for an adequate intervention, for informed actions against prejudice and negative stereotyping. (Compare, for example, discussions or documentation in Allport, 1954; Dismantling the mask of enmity, n.d.; Eckhardt, 1991; Göpfert, 1985; Heradstveit, 1991; Hoffman, 1986; Holt & Silverstein,

1989; Keen, 1986; Kelman, 1965; Kristiansen & Rasmussen, 1988; Mellville, 1988; Mende & Rathenow, 1990; Nerman, 1918; Ostermann & Nicklas, 1984; Overskov, 1991; Rieber, 1991; Schmidhäuser, 1987; Silverstein, 1989; Sommer, 1988; Wahlström, 1987, 1989; White, 1984.)

This paper presents a simple technique that may be used in such studies and a series of findings from a cross-national study of university students from four countries obtained via this technique.

The approaches used in these studies were influenced by the conditions of the Cold War between East and West. However, the special findings should naturally be seen in relation to recent developments. The data collections were undertaken in 1988 and 1989 (more detailed information on the various subgroups will be given below) at a time characterized by a certain disarmament optimism. Reagan and Gorbachev had held historic summit meetings. The worst Cold War period seemed to be over, and the media were less prone than earlier to pass on and promote rigid enemy images.

Cross-national cooperation

This cross-national study was originally initiated at a conference in Seville, Spain in 1987. After various contacts, it was possible to arrange substudies in four countries:

Country:	*Responsible researchers:*
Denmark	Søren Keldorff
Finland	Riitta Wahlström
Sweden	Åke Bjerstedt
USSR	Olga Melnikova and Yuri Shirkov

It would have been interesting to include some additional countries, but the four data collections now carried out were considered to be of sufficient interest for a first exploration.

Some other researchers have been involved in our discussions, especially Jørgen Pauli Jensen, who has been with us from the start and who hosted our working group during two working conferences in his Copenhagen home. Pauli Jensen has been writing on prejudice and enemy images for several years (for example, Jensen, 1984, 1988, 1989).

Three of the substudies have been described in separate reports (Bjerstedt, 1989; Keldorff, 1991; Melnikova & Shirkov, 1990). In addition, some similar data from Norway have been given a preliminary presentation (cf Richardsen, 1990).

In the present paper, we will give a brief overview of some of the main results from Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the USSR, arranged so as to facilitate comparisons.

Thanks are due to various research students and research assistants who have helped in the process of data collection and data analysis (in the Danish study: C. Frankel, H. Jensen and J. Lindhard Mortensen; in the Swedish study: G. Ekstrand, M. Krenzisky and S.E. Svensson).

Method

Data collection technique

A number of techniques for studying the phenomenon of enemy images among people in general would be possible: interviews, questionnaires, observations of conversations etc. At an early stage one of the researchers in our group criticized the too rigid data collection techniques often used in studies of prejudice and stereotyping, leaving too little freedom for the subjects to express spontaneous and "multi-dimensional" reactions (Bjerstedt, 1960). These arguments also seemed relevant for the present purpose. Hence, we chose to try out a fairly unstructured instrument: an associative technique where the persons studied were asked to write down all the words that occurred to them during a brief period (two minutes) after having heard a specific stimulus expression. The key stimulus expression was "enemies of our country". What would people think of first, when they heard this phrase? Would a large majority think of a specific foreign country, or would the answers be more varied?

Other important stimuli would be the names of the superpowers ("The United States", "The Soviet Union"). What would our subjects think of first on hearing these names? Would they mainly think of these superpowers in terms of military threats, or would the responses cover a broader range of possibilities?

It was also decided to include some other, tentatively related stimulus expressions in the study: "The future", "Avoiding war", "Peace" and "Human rights". For example, would our subjects tend to think of

"avoiding war" in terms of "military strength", "armaments" and "deterrence" – or, rather, in terms of "disarmament", "negotiations" and "non-violent conflict resolution"?

This kind of testing should be easy to carry out in groups. Subjects would get a simple response form, where they could fill in some background information (such as age and sex) at the top, and where there were writing areas for the seven stimulus expressions (indicated only by the numbers 1 to 7; the stimulus expressions should not be printed on the response form in order to avoid the simultaneous influence of other expressions).

In the general instructions to the subjects it seemed wise to indicate (a) that there are no right or wrong answers; (b) that they would only have two minutes for each task, so that they should write quickly; (c) that they should not ask any questions or make any comments (in order not to influence others).

After the general instructions, the students should be given one word or phrase at a time and be instructed to write down their associations under the corresponding number on the response form.

The order of the stimuli was decided to be as follows (the same order for all groups): 1. The future, 2. Avoiding war, 3. Enemies of our country, 4. Peace, 5. The United States, 6. The Soviet Union, 7. Human rights.

Data analysis procedures

It seemed to be a natural procedure in the analysis of the responses to typify anwers, try to classify the material into major categories and give some impression of the frequency of responses within some of these categories.

Classifying free-text material, using such a content-analysis approach, is not always an easy task. We are dealing with a process of interpretation where the special views and experiences of the analyzer can exert some influence; that is, there is always the risk of subjective classification.

In order to clarify the possible influence of this kind of subjectivity and to improve the classification, we decided - after some preliminary work - to use two people in the main content analyses. These two persons should work independently of each other. In a first step, this would give us a picture of the degree of correspondence (or lack of correspondence) in such an independent categorization of the present type of material. Then,

in a second phase, the cases of non-correspondence could be especially examined, and a third judge could make a final decision on the categorization of these cases.

The outcome of this procedure will be further described in the result section below. The figures that will be presented in the main tables are our "final figures", that is, those resulting after this procedure using three judges has been utilized. This applies to the sub-studies in Denmark, Sweden and the USSR. It was not possible to use two persons to classify the responses in Finland, however. In this case the responsible researcher made the classification herself, using the same categories as in the other sub-studies.

Subjects

Various types of groups would be of potential interest in studies of this kind. A very ambitious study would, for example, include a representative sample of the adult population. From the point of view of educational and developmental psychology, it would be of interest to use school pupils at different grade levels. In this pilot study, it was decided to use two groups of university students in each country.

The aim for each sub-study was to test about 200 university students, equally divided between students of economics (finance) and students planning to become class teachers. It would be of interest to include both sexes, but since the sex distribution is known to vary from one study area to another, an equal number of students of each sex was not aimed at. The students should preferably be in the age range of 18-25 years.

The groups actually studied in the four countries are briefly described in Table 1 and the following text.

The testing of the groups from *Denmark* was carried out at the beginning of the autumn term (September) 1988. All the test subjects were students from Aalborg. Age range: 20-25 years.

The students from *Finland* analyzed here were tested as follows: The group of trainee teachers (from Jyväskylä) in April, 1988, and the students of economics (from Helsinki) in October, 1989. The main age range was 18-25 (with a few older students).

The students from *Sweden* were tested at the end of the spring term (May), 1988. All of them studied in the south of Sweden (Lund, Malmö, Kristianstad). Age range: 19-25.

Table 1. Groups of subjects: Distribution over study area and sex

Country	Students of economics		Trainee teachers		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Denmark	50	50	23	77	200
Finland	50	50	39	61	200
Sweden	50	50	16	84	200
USSR	56	44	46	54	200

The students from the *USSR*, finally, were tested in September, 1989. The ages ranged from 16 to 25.

The types of students included as well as the sex and age distributions in the four sub-studies were highly similar (more details can be found in the separate reports). The data collections were carried out at different times, however. This was a consequence of the step-by-step development of the project and the practical possibilities in the different research settings. We felt that this was acceptable in a pilot study of this type, but that it should be kept in mind when analyzing the data and – if possible – be avoided in similar studies in the future.

Results

"Enemies of our country"

The first impression of the answers to the key stimulus "enemies of our country" in all the sub-studies is that there is a very great variety of answers. We may quote here from some of the separate reports:

The report from the *Swedish* sub-study: "Besides what would seem to be some of the 'expected categories' referring to military threats (foreign countries or military pacts), a large number of other types of threats are mentioned: political-societal phenomena (extremism, terrorism, inflation), medical threats (aids, cancer), environmental threats (pollution, destruction of the ozone layer etc), various categories of persons, sometimes rather vaguely delimited (fanatics, parasites, senile power figures, we ourselves), character-related traits (lack of understanding, envy) and many others. - In addition, there are answers that explicitly

deny the existence of enemies: 'Sweden has no enemies – neutral ...'." (Bjerstedt, 1989, p. 6).

The report from the *Soviet* study uses seven categories to give an overview of the associations of its respondents to "enemies of our country" (Melnikova & Shirkov, 1990, p. 6):

"1 – personality features, intents, bearers of those features, intents;
2 – party, Soviet functionaries and state administration in the USSR;
3 – social and political phenomena of our society;
4 – events and phenomena of Soviet history, names of political leaders of the past;
5 – external 'geo-political' subjects including abstract notions ('capitalism', 'bourgeoisie');
6 – ecological threats;
7 – certain layers of society."

What we were especially interested in here was obviously references to what we may call *"geo-political enemies"* (external enemies in terms of military pacts, foreign countries or related expressions such as the superpowers, the Americans, the Russians and the like).

We decided to add together in one category the number of persons making at least one reference to geo-political enemies. In Table 2 we illustrate the outcome in the various sub-groups (expressed here in terms of percentages).

Table 2. "Enemies of our country": Percentage of students in the various subject categories referring to "geo-political enemies"

Sub-study (country)	Study area: Economics	Teaching	Sex: Males	Females	Total group
Denmark	20	18	19	19	19
Finland	10	10	9	11	10
Sweden	63	43	64	48	53
USSR	17	10	20	7	14

The total percentages of references to geo-political enemies vary in our sub-studies from 10% to 53%. It is debatable whether the highest percentage here, 53% of the total group making at least one reference to geo-political enemies, is to be considered a "high" or a "low" figure. Since the expression "enemies of our country" can be said to "invite" the test

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

subject to make this type of response, we would consider the number fairly low, especially when also considering the broad range of other answers occurring at the same time, as well as the variety of geo-political answers given in this sub-study. There was obviously no specific country or pact that was singled out by a majority of our students. Thus, we cannot talk about any enemy stereotype in this group, even though it could be noted that the Soviet Union attracted most responses of this type.

However, even though not "high" in itself, the Swedish percentage is considerably higher than the corresponding figures in the other three sub-studies, which can be said to have *very low* percentages of references to geo-political enemies. It is only possible to speculate on why this is so. Two factors may be mentioned as possibly contributing to this difference. One is that the Swedish study is the "oldest" one; that is, it was closer in time to the cold-war period. Another factor is that at the time there had been a period of discussions in the Swedish mass media about foreign submarines violating Swedish waters. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that cold war attitudes are more persistent in Sweden than in the other countries involved (cf. Kloep, 1991; Øberg, 1988).

Looking also at possible differences between sub-groups within the countries, we note that the respondents in Denmark and Finland show rather even distributions over the sub-groups, while there seem to be both sex differences and differences between study groups in the studies carried out in Sweden and in the USSR.

In both cases there is a clear tendency for males to make more references to geo-political enemies than females, and for students of economics to give a higher number of such answers than teacher trainees.

In Table 3 we illustrate another category of answers to the same stimulus expression, "enemies of our country", that is, references to *"environmental threats"*.

To give responses about environmental threats to the stimulus expression "enemies of our country" does not seem to be very "natural"; the expression does *not* "invite" this kind of reply. The fact that in two of our sub-studies, 26% of the students make one or more references to environmental threats could therefore be seen as a relatively high figure. Thoughts about environmental threats are obviously fairly easy to activate among many of our present-day students. However, this was not true in the group of Soviet respondents at this time, which may partly have to do

Table 3. "Enemies of our country": Percentage of students in the various subject categories referring to "environmental threats".

Sub-study (country)	Study area: Economics	Teaching	Sex: Males	Females	Total group
Denmark	19	32	21	28	26
Finland	13	17	22	9	15
Sweden	24	27	21	28	26
USSR	5	1	2	4	3

with the fact that the Soviet respondents tended to focus their attention on other problems: on various "internal" groups, such as bureaucrats or political leaders in the past.

Looking at sub-group differences within countries, we see a certain tendency for teacher trainees to bring up environmental issues more often than students of economics, and for females to do so more often than males (the sub-study from Finland has the opposite sex pattern, however).

In Table 4 we illustrate yet another category of answers to the stimulus "enemies of our country", i.e. the *"we ourselves"* type of responses. This category was not analyzed separately in the sub-study from the USSR; therefore, only the three Scandinavian groups are included in the table.

Table 4. "Enemies of our country": Percentage of students in the various subject categories referring to "we ourselves"

Sub-study (country)	Study area: Economics	Teaching	Sex: Males	Females	Total group
Denmark	44	40	44	41	42
Finland	10	7	9	8	9
Sweden	10	5	6	8	8

This category of answers was somewhat unexpected as a major response to "enemies of our country". But as we can see, this type of reply occurred with non-negligible frequencies in all groups that were analyzed into this category. It can also be noted that this type of reaction seemed

especially strong in Denmark. Some examples: "Denmark has wanted peace for years – the only enemy to us is ourselves with our egocentrism and self-assertion"; "We ourselves are the enemies of Denmark. The old, traditional people's images of enemies are rubbish and nonsense". These answers sometimes seem to echo self-critical discussions in the mass media, but may also sometimes represent an active denial of the concept of external enemies. Since the content analyses were made separately and by different people in the various sub-studies, we have to recognize the risk that slightly different categorization habits may exaggerate differences of the type seen in Table 4. Nevertheless, the special position of the Danish respondents deserves special attention in future studies (for further discussion, see Keldorff, 1991).

"The United States" and "The Soviet Union"

In the Swedish sub-study, which has the highest frequency of geo-political references, the two superpowers were the only countries that were mentioned with a less than negligible frequency as "enemies". In the associative technique used, "The United States" and "The Soviet Union" were also used as separate stimulus expressions. Here we thus have the possibility of gaining some more information. To what extent do we get clearly negative images of these countries among our subjects? To what extent are such clearly negative images also images of threat? To what extent do we get positive images and mixed images (mixing positive and negative traits)?

An attempt was made to classify each individual's associations to each of these two stimuli into one of four main categories: positive (+), negative (-), mixed (+/-) and neutral (0). The results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

In these analyses, "positive" associations means "only positive", or "positive and neutral"; "negative" means "only negative", or "negative and neutral". "Neutral" associations means "only neutral". Combinations of "positive" and "negative" associations are classified in the "mixed" category.

Table 5. "The United States": Percentages of students (total group) in the various sub-studies giving "positive" (+), "negative" (-), "mixed" (+/-) or "neutral" (0) associations

Sub-study (country)	+	-	+/-	0
Denmark	6	27	62	5
Finland	24	23	40	14
Sweden	11	36	43	9
USSR	46	6	31	17

Table 6. "The Soviet Union": Percentages of students (total group) in the various sub-studies giving "positive" (+), "negative" (-), "mixed" (+/-) or "neutral" (0) associations

Sub-study (country)	+	-	+/-	0
Denmark	2	30	65	4
Finland	12	33	36	15
Sweden	4	45	45	7
USSR	6	36	40	18

The general picture is fairly clear. We do *not* find any dominating majority of subjects giving negative stereotypes of these countries. If we disregard the respondents from the USSR for a moment (since their role of judging their own country and "the other superpower" was somewhat special), we see that the superpowers do get negative associations from a number of students (between 23 and 36% give negative associations, as defined here, to the United States; between 30 and 45% give negative associations to the Soviet Union). However, many students give a mixed bag of positive and negative associations (between 40 and 62% in the case of the U.S. and between 36 and 65% in the case of the Soviet Union).

The negative characteristics that are mentioned contain some references to military threat, but many other aspects are also mentioned.

It is of special interest to note the reactions of the Soviet students. The United States is considered the principal rival of the USSR in military-political confrontations, but it is not perceived by the Soviet

students as a traditional enemy. On the contrary, the Soviet students give more positive associations to the United States than to their own country. In comparing the Soviet data with the data from the three Scandinavian countries, we come across a telling contradiction between the psychological opinion facts and the traditional "political realities": our Soviet respondents make a more positive assessment of the United States than do the respondents from all the other countries involved in our study and display a considerably more positive reaction than the students from the Nato ally, Denmark.

"Avoiding war"

The students' associations to the stimulus expression "avoiding war" (or "prevention of war" used in the USSR group) were classified into four main categories: (1) expressions associating only to armaments, deterrence or other forms of military force (according to the old saying "Si vis pacem, para bellum"); (2) expressions associating only to non-violent solutions (conflict resolution, disarmament, negotiations etc.); (3) "other" associations (for example, judgements about the possibility of avoiding war); and (4) "mixed" associations (from more than one category of the ones previously mentioned). – In Table 7 we present the main results for the first two categories, which are of most interest to our present purpose.

Table 7. "Avoiding war": Percentages of students in the various subject categories making references to military means only (m) or to non-violent solutions only (n-v).

Sub-study (country)	Study area: Economics		Teaching		Sex: Males		Females		Total group	
	m	n-v	m	n-v	m	n-v	m	n-v	m	n-v
Denmark	7	59	1	63	7	52	2	66	4	61
Finland	3	45	4	38	7	35	1	47	4	42
Sweden	3	36	0	57	3	35	1	52	1	46
USSR	9	37	11	69	15	42	5	64	10	53

It can be noted that the first category (with "para bellum" associations) attracted few answers (in some sub-groups extremely few), whereas the opposite category (with non-violent associations) contained a relatively high number of respondents.

In all sub-studies, there were more females than males in the non-violent category. In three out of our four sub-studies, there were also more teacher trainees than students of economics in this category.

Some comments and conclusions

Since enemy images are important ingredients in preparedness for war, it would seem to be a valid task for peace research to study their characteristics in order to be better able to counteract reality-distant imagery. In so doing, we should be aware that enemy images are not a homogeneous and simple phenomenon.

One sub-category of enemy images consists of those expressed by the political and military *establishment* of a country: "enemy image (e)". These images may sometimes correspond to the actual cognitions (c) among these people: "enemy image (e=c)". But sometimes they do not; instead they are then seen as an instrument (i) to achieve certain political ends: "enemy image ($e \neq c$, i)".

Another sub-category of enemy images contains those expressed in the *mass media* of a country: "enemy image (m)". They may, at certain times and in certain countries, be quite diverse, while at other times and in other countries they tend to focus on a more homogeneous image. Again, such expressions of enemy images in the mass media may correspond to the actual cognitions among those who express them: "enemy image (m=c)". But sometimes, and especially in times of international tension, they do not. Key persons in the mass media are often part of the military system of the country with an explicit duty to promote the official "security" policies. In this process, the enemy images expressed by mass media may also be more instrumental than cognitively true: "enemy image (m=c, i)".

A third sub-category of enemy images represents those expressed in popular *fiction* in a country, such as films, cartoons and popular literature: "enemy image (f)". Again they may be more or less diverse, and they may be more or less consistent with the cognitions of those who author them. It is often natural for the constructor of popular fiction to use "bad guys" and "good guys", and the particular "bad guys" chosen are

adapted to the enemy images prevalent in the establishment and/or in the mass media, since this is what the writer (etc.) expects that people would like to hear or see: "enemy image (f=e or f=m)". There may also be more active instructions from established groups to use popular fiction to spread a certain message.

In the present paper we have not dealt with any of those categories of enemy images. Instead we have attempted to get information about the true cognitions among individuals within the general population or, rather, a special sub-group of this general population: university students.

University students are sometimes chosen in pilot studies because they may be easier to approach by researchers than the general population, and this has been part of the motivation in this study as well. In addition, however, university students are important in opinion studies as being what is sometimes called *"pre-influentials"*, that is, people who can be expected to be recruited to influential positions in a society in the future. What the university students of today think and feel about international matters may very well be of considerable importance for what happens in the international society in the near future.

Like other citizens, our university students are also influenced by the enemy images expressed in other parts of society, for example the political and military establishment, the mass media and the available popular fiction. Since students often have limited direct access to facts about foreign nations, for example, this is unavoidable. However, university students are likely to be somewhat more resistant than the general population to influences that represent oversimplified images, including enemy images. Their university training helps them to be more critical of one-sided and undocumented assertions (and can, in this respect, be seen as part of a general peace education).

In order to know more about where this leaves us with respect to specific groups, we need to have *instruments* to make relevant empirical studies. In the study reported on in this paper we have tried out a special associative technique. Eight hundred university students representing four countries (Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the USSR) were given the task of writing down free associations to seven stimulus expressions dealing with enemy images, the superpowers and related phenomena. The main aims were to investigate whether such a technique could provide useful material for analysis and what picture this technique would give of the particular groups studied.

The technique was found to be easy to use in the data collection situation and to provide rich and varied material for analysis. To quote one of the research reports: "I find the associative technique used in this study a brilliant hybrid form between the very boring and oppressive questionnaire form and the very time-consuming interview form" (Keldorff, 1991, p. 26).

As for the analysis procedure, using mainly a classification approach, we have to recognize that it takes time and involves some risk of subjectivity; but it seems to give data of potential interest. The specific three-judge technique (described and tested in this study) considerably reduces the risk of subjectivity.

According to this instrument, the present groups of university students from Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the USSR cannot be said to be characterized to any great extent by negative and stereotyped images of foreign countries or other foreign groups as enemies, or by militaristic attitudes in general.

Associations to "enemies of our country" did include a number of geo-political enemy responses. But the geo-political associations were varied and mixed with many other types of threat images, for example, dealing with environmental problems. In the sub-study which showed the highest number of geo-political references, the only two countries that attracted a sizable proportion of enemy associations were the two superpowers. These countries were also presented as separate stimuli for associations. In that case, we did not discover any majority of negative stereotypes, but a considerable variation in responses. Many associations fell in the "mixed" category (with both positive and negative associations). – It could also be mentioned that, when associating to "avoiding war", very few students talked about deterrence or military force as an instrument, whereas a larger group thought about non-violent procedures and disarmament.

It was especially interesting to study the reactions of the Soviet students and find some telling contradictions between the actual imagery among these young people and traditional "political realities". Our Soviet respondents made a more positive assessment of the United States than did the students from all the other countries involved in our study, and had more positive associations to the United States than to their own country.

– – –

In several respects, our groups of pre-influentials give us some hope for the future. The conversion from a militaristic to a non-militaristic international society will be considerably facilitated if the flexible and

non-stereotypic images we seem to find among many of these university students are more common in the future among our political influentials and among people in general.

In this process more research related to the imagery among various groups seems very relevant. In this study, comparisons between countries as well as between sub-groups within countries (such as between males and females or between students of economics and teacher trainees) show that the present technique is sensitive to group differences. Therefore, and considering the generally rich and varied material obtained, we find that this technique can be recommended for further work in this field.

References

Allport, G.W. *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Bjerstedt, Å. "Ego-involved world-mindedness", nationality stereotypes, and methods of research. *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 1960, *4*, 185-192.

Bjerstedt, Å. Explorations of enemy images using an associative technique. *Educational and Psychological Interactions* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 95, 1989.

Dismantling the mask of enmity: An educational resource manual on the psychology of enemy images. Washington, DC: Psychologists for Social Responsibility, n.d.

Eckhardt, W. Making and breaking enemy images. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals,* 1991, *22*(1), 87-95.

Göpfert, H. *Ausländerfeindlichkeit durch Unterricht.* Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1985.

Heradstveit, D. Fjendens seks ansigter. *Vandkunsten* (Copenhagen), 1991, (5), 223-234.

Hoffmann, J. *Stereotypen, Vorurteile, Völkerbilder in Ost und West – in Wissenschaft und Unterricht: Eine Bibliographie.* Wiesbaden, 1986.

Holt, R.R. & Silverstein, B. (Eds.) The image of the enemy. (Special issue of:) *Journal of Social Issues,* 1989, *45*(2).

Jensen, J.P. Fjendebilleder og anden militarisering af børn og unge. In: Jensen, J.P. & Keldorff, S. (Eds.) *Fredsundervisning*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1984. Pp. 94-110.

Jensen, J.P. *Børns udvikling og livsvilkår*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1988.

Jensen, J.P. "Jeg er ikke rasist, men ..." – om fordomme og fjendebilleder. *Psykologi* (Copenhagen), 1989, (June), 5-16.

Keen, S. *Faces of the enemy: Reflections on the hostile imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

Keldorff, S. The image of the enemy – from an external, military to an internal, civilian enemy: A Danish pilot study exploring enemy images using an associative technique. *Educational and Psychological Interactions* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 108, 1991.

Kelman, H.C. (Ed.) *International behavior*. New York: Holt, 1965.

Kloep, M. Prejudice and peace: Is the Swedish youth neutral in its attitudes? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 1991, *32*, 31-37.

Kristiansen, K.K. & Rasmussen, J.R. (Eds.) *Fjendebilleder og fremmedhad*. Copenhagen: FN-forbundet, 1988.

Mellville, A. *How we view each other: The enemy image and new political thinking*. Moscow: Novosti Press, 1988.

Melnikova, O. & Shirkov, Y. Image of the enemy: A description of the existing image of the enemy among the Soviet people by an associative technique. *Educational and Psychological Interactions* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 102, 1990.

Mende, K.D. & Rathenow, H.-F. (Eds.) *Vorurteile und Feindbilder im Ost-West-Verhältnis*. Berlin: Technische Universität, 1990.

Nerman, T. *Folkhatet*. Stockholm: Svenska Andelsförlaget, 1918.

Ostermann, Ä. & Nicklas, H. *Vorurteile und Feindbilder*. (3 Aufl.) Weinheim: Beltz Verlag, 1984.

Overskov, C. *De indfødte – som den hvide mand så dem*. Copenhagen: Branner & Koch, 1991.

Richardsen, R. Fiendebilder. (Manuscript.) Tromsø, Norway: University, 1990.

Rieber, R.W. (Ed.) *The psychology of war and peace: The image of the enemy*. New York: Plenum, 1991.

Schmidhäuser, U. Vorurteile, Stereotype, Feindbilder. In: *Praxis der Umwelt- und Friedenserziehung. Band 1: Grundlagen*. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1987. Pp. 358-363.

Silverstein, B. Enemy images: The psychology of U.S. attitudes and cognitions regarding the Soviet Union. *American Psychologist*, 1989, *44*, 903-913.

Sommer, G. et al. (Eds.) *Feindbilder im Dienste der Aufrüstung*. (2. Aufl.) Marburg: Interdisziplinäre Arbeitsgruppe Friedens- und Abrüstungsforschung, 1988.

Wahlström, R. An enemy image as a psychological antecedent of warfare and armament. In: *Proceedings of the Congress of European Psychologists for Peace*. Helsinki: The Finnish Psychological Society, 1987. Pp. 144-154.

Wahlström, R. Enemy images and peace education. *Reprints and Miniprints* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 660, 1989.

White, R.K. *Fearful warriors: A psychological profile of U.S.-Soviet relations*. New York: The Free Press, 1984.

Øberg, J. 13 myter om Sveriges försvar. *TFF Nyhetsbrev*, 1988, (7-8), 1-7.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE